

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the careful examination of the application. However, in view of the foregoing amendments and the remarks that follow, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections and objections.

Art Rejections:

Claims 1, 6-19, 21-24, 27 and 34-38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by EP1 004 269 A1, hereinafter *Carrozzi*. And, claims 2-4, 20, 25-26, and 28-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carrozzi* in view of JP 11-028199, hereinafter *Tazaki*.

The claim now defines that the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus has wheels, rollers, or other means for sliding or rotating the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus relative to the patient table. The patient table has a supporting structure that is slidable in at least one direction, and the patient table and the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus have a curved connection therebetween that allows relative rotation between the patient table and the magnet structure when connected to each other.

The claimed combination is not taught or suggested by *Carrozzi*. Specifically, see paragraph [0048] of the published application, wherein it states that the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus may be rotated. *Carrozzi* teaches a magnetic base 40 (Figs. 15 and 16) that are on wheels. However, the connection between the base 40 and the table 2 does not allow relative rotation between the

patient table and the magnet base when they are connected to each other. Note that the table 2 is connected to the base 40 with a noncircular shaped piece, and is fastened with either velcro or pins. See paragraph [0059]. Accordingly, it is not possible to rotate the base relative to the patient table when they are connected to each other. Such a connection enables the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus to turn with respect to the table so that adjustments can be made in a room that is so small that there is not room to rotate the table about the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus.

In the Figs. 15 and 16 embodiment of *Carozzi*, the table can be moved linearly with respect to the base, but it cannot be rotated while connected thereto.

By providing the base block of the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus with the curved connection and wheels, rollers, or other means for sliding or rotating, as claimed in claim 1, the system according to claim 1 is more versatile than that disclosed by *Carrozzi*. Accordingly, claim 1 is now patentable over *Carrozzi*. Claims 2-4 and 6-27 depend directly or indirectly from amended claim 1, and are thus also patentable over *Carrozzi*. The dependent claims recite additional features, which may also provide additional reasons for patentability of the dependent claims.

Claim 28 has been amended. It now defines a system that includes, among other elements, a magnetic resonance imaging apparatus and two patient tables that are coupled to said apparatus. A guide for relative slidable displacement of said patient tables and said apparatus consists of least two diametrically opposite, separate curved sections mounted on opposite sides of the apparatus, which sections extend through an angle of less than 180°, such that the two separate guide

sections are coaxial to each other and the ***magnetic resonance imaging apparatus may rotate coaxially to said separate guide sections.***

Tazaki, like *Carozzi*, does not teach the claimed combination that includes, among other elements, a system wherein the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus may rotate coaxially to said separate guide sections. Accordingly, the ability to have relative rotation between the tables and the magnets is dependent upon having a room large enough to accompany movement of the tables.

Accordingly, claim 28 is also patentable over the applied prior art.

Claim 34 defines a system comprising a magnetic resonance imaging apparatus and at least one patient table or two tables that are coupled to the apparatus. The system further includes a platform that rotates with an axis of rotation coaxial to the axis of the sector shaped guide for the tables. In addition, the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus is positioned on the platform. *Carrozzi* does not teach or suggest that the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus is positioned on a rotatable platform.

The Examiner alleges only that the tables can move or slide. However, in claim 34 a platform rotates with an axis of rotation coaxial to an axis of the sector-shaped guide for the at least one of the tables, and the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus is positioned on the platform. Accordingly, the magnetic resonance imaging apparatus rotates by virtue of its placement on the platform.

Accordingly, claim 34 is also patentable.

Claims 29, 30, 32, 33, and 35-37 depend from either claim 28 or 34, and are thus also patentable at least for the reasons set forth with respect to the independent

claims. In addition, the dependent claims provide additional features which further distinguish over the prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejections and objections. In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: January 21, 2008

By: /WCRoland/
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620